





IN THE

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS:

Arman Glodjo, Nathan D. Bronson, and

Scott E. Harrington

SERIAL NO.:

10/005,609

FILING DATE:

November 7, 2001

TITLE:

GLOBAL ELECTRONIC TRADING SYSTEM

EXAMINER:

Alain L. Bashore

GROUP ART UNIT:

1762

CONFIRMATION NO.:

9713

ATTY. DKT. NO.:

44422593-6028

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Attention: Official Draftsman, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below;

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT Attention: Official Draftsman **COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS** P.O. BOX 1450 **ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450**

SUBMISSION OF SUBSTITUTE FORMAL DRAWINGS

SIR:

Enclosed for filing in the above-identified patent application are 31 sheets of substitute formal drawings, replacing the 31 sheets of drawings that are currently on file. These substitute formal drawings overcome the objections raised in the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review dated June 2, 2005 that was issued in the divisional application (U.S. Serial No. 10/741,735 filed December 18, 2003).

For additional information, please refer to the enclosed printout of an e-mail exchange between the undersigned and Nhan Tang of the USPTO's Publications Branch regarding said divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward J. Radlo Attorney of Record

Reg. No. 26,793

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P. O. Box 061080 Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080 (415) 882-2402

enclosures

cc: A. Glodjo (via e-mail w/encls.)
IP/T docket CH (w/o encls.)

Radlo, Edward J.

From: Tang, Nhan [Nhan.Tang@USPTO.GOV]

Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2006 9:23 AM

To: Radio, Edward J.

Subject: RE: U.S. patent application 10/741,735 (our docket number 8682)

Dear Mr. Radlo:

The requirement for corrected drawings was sent with the Notice of Allowability and must be complied with. Failure to comply will result in abandonment of the application.

According to the 948, the drawings have multiple problems not just the problem with Figure 3. All of these problems need to be addressed and corrected drawings submitted by the due date.

Regards,

Nhan Tang 2900 South Tower 703-305-0333 Ext. 132

-----Original Message-----

From: Radlo, Edward J. [mailto:eradlo@sonnenschein.com]

Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 7:55 PM

To: Tang, Nhan

Cc: arman@valaquenta.bm; jrm928@sbcglobal.net

Subject: U.S. patent application 10/741,735 (our docket number 8682)

<<8682Drawings.pdf>>

Dear Mr. Tang:

As you requested, attached is a PDF of the set of drawings currently on file in this patent application.

We need a reading from the USPTO as soon as possible as to whether the USPTO is going to force us to renumber the drawings (and make concomitant changes to the specification) just because there is no Figure 3. The specification makes it clear that there is no Figure 3. The drawings are consecutively numbered, as required by the Rules. One of the definitions of "consecutive" in my Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (copyright 1950) is "succeeding one another in a regular order, series, or sequence". The drawings currently on file satisfy that criterion.

Ed Radlo
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP
685 Market Street, Sixth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
415.882.2402 direct
415.543.5472 fax
eradlo@sonnenschein.com